

Message

From: Penalva-Arana, Carolina [Penalva-Arana.Carolina@epa.gov]
Sent: 2/10/2022 2:48:32 PM
To: Ross, Mary [Ross.Mary@epa.gov]; Deener, Kathleen [Deener.Kathleen@epa.gov]
CC: D'Amico, Louis [DAmico.Louis@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: CRA external and internal revisions summaries plus STPC Responses to Options
Attachments: Combined RAF comment on CRA Guidelines_RedLine.docx

Here is the Red Line version of the CRA after external peer review. As mentioned, none of the changes are substantial, making this document very similar to the first draft approved by the STPC. Should we share this with Maureen and the rest of the STPC? If so, Sabrina can upload it to the STPC invite.

Carolina

Carolina Peñalva-Arana, Ph.D. (*Pronouns: She, Her, Hers*)
Supervisor, Science Advisory Branch
ORD/OSAP - Science Policy Division
(ph) 202.564.4816
(cell) 202.816.0885

From: Ross, Mary <Ross.Mary@epa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, February 9, 2022 8:23 PM
To: Penalva-Arana, Carolina <Penalva-Arana.Carolina@epa.gov>; Deener, Kathleen <Deener.Kathleen@epa.gov>
Cc: D'Amico, Louis <DAmico.Louis@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: CRA external and internal revisions summaries plus STPC Responses to Options

Thanks for sharing this information, Carolina. As we discussed this afternoon, we really need some sunshine on the package. Without knowing the extent of revisions made to address peer review comments, people are assuming the revisions are major. If we can get more info to people it might calm the waters. Some of the internal issues we ought to be able to put to bed – particularly the “guidance” comment. I’d be happy to meet to strategize. I think we have pretty full schedules tomorrow, but I can be available on Friday morning (it’s blocked off as my off-day but I intend to work the first part of the day).

From: Penalva-Arana, Carolina <Penalva-Arana.Carolina@epa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, February 9, 2022 3:43 PM
To: Ross, Mary <Ross.Mary@epa.gov>; Deener, Kathleen <Deener.Kathleen@epa.gov>
Cc: D'Amico, Louis <DAmico.Louis@epa.gov>
Subject: CRA external and internal revisions summaries plus STPC Responses to Options

Hi Mary.

Thanks for taking my call and the great talk after the SSP meeting. As I mentioned, it is clear that there is a belief that the draft of the CRA sent out for external peer review has drastically changed and that after internal peer review it will be completely different than that first draft. After checking in with Lawrence, it is clear that the external peer review comments were not extremely helpful and the changes may not amount to much. The internal comments may have raised some issues that may take longer to resolve but that is just more because of the speed at which the RAF moves (but with Lou as ED that may change 😊).

Attached are 1-pagers on the external peer review and current internal peer review issues. We will include these on the Read ahead package for Maureen, so she has a better grasp on the issues or non-issues. I am also

attaching a table with all the STPC responses to the options memo. Let's discuss more tomorrow. I am out to a Drs appt now and will be back on early tomorrow. Thanks again for the help.

All the best,
Carolina

Carolina Peñalva-Arana, Ph.D. (*Pronouns: She, Her, Hers*)
Supervisor (BC)
Science Advisory Branch
Office of Science Advisor, Policy and Engagement
Office of Research and Development
US Environmental Protection Agency
(ph) 202.564.4816
(cell) 202.816.0885